rather than a distinct genus; but the total lack of a basal noteh or truncation is a character usually considered of generic importance.
P. Rovirosai n. sp. (Pl. III, fige. \&, 9.)
thell oblong-conic, very solid, whitish, encircled by numerous narrow smooth spiral lire of a dark brown color, and somewhat alternating in size. Spire conical, apical whorl eroded; whorls 5 remaining, slightly convex, the last whorl large, regularly convex. Aperture a little less than half the length of the shell, orate, angular above; outer lip regularly acute; inner lip strongly calloused.

Alt. 20, diam. 12 mill. (old specimen.)
Alt. 162, diam. 9 mill. (young specimen.)
Two -pecimens are before me, collected by Prof. Rovirosa at the mountains of Poana, State of Tabasco. The older inclividual (Pl. III, fig. \&) is considerably worn ; the other is perfect but not wholly adult, and neither contains the operculum. The species is allied, apparently, to the Cuban Melemin brevis Orb., but is decidedy longer, and the lira are much stronger.

## Explanation of Plate III.

Figs. 1, 2, 3, Chrysodomus (Sipho) Stonei Pils.
F'ig. 4, Euculodium compuctum Pik.
Fig. 5, 6, Puchychilus glaphyrus var.
Fig. T, P.glaphyrus var. potemarchns. Pils.
Fiogs. E, 9, Potemumax Rorimosai Pils.
NOTE ON CYPR EA GREEGORI FORD.

## Bl EDGAR A. SMITII.

I sincerely trust that Mr. Ford ${ }^{1}$ wrongly estimates the critical acumen of modern conchological students. He says that most of them would probably have made (: Greegori a speces instead of a variety.

There is no dount that the new French School of Conchologists would agree with Mr. Ford in considering the shell in question specifically distinct from C. cruenta, but I am glad to say that in England (and I hope in America also) the ideas are not so advanced (?). Althongh examples of this shell have been in the National collection for more than 50 years, no British author has ever suggested that they belonged to a distinct species.

[^0]I fully admit that the differences pointed out by the author are fairly constant, and that examples are pretty easily separable from the typical form of cruenta. But admitting this does not prove that they ought to be held specifically distinct, and I venture to suggest that they only constitute a recognisable race or variety of an already known species.

The chief object of this note, however, is to make complaint respecting the name which Mr. Ford has imposed upon his so-called species.

When he published Greegori as a varietal name, it was already five years previously preceded by Mr. Melvill's varietal name coloba, ${ }^{\text {b }}$ and therefore there is no question I think, which name should be employed if this variety be regarded as a distinct species. Right and justice (end even courtesy) at once direct us in the present case.

Mr. Ford is under the impression that Mr. Melvill was in a state of uncertanty whether the form in question was a variety of cruenta or caurica. I find no such impression conveyed by Mr. Melvill's sentences which are criticised by Mr. Ford. Moreover, in the catalogue of species (l. c., p. 243), Mr. Melvill ranges the var. coloba under cruenta and in addition gives a representation of the ventral side of the shell (Pl. I, fig. 7).

## LAND MOLLUSCA OBSERVED IN THE GASPE REGION.

## A. W. HANHAM, QUEBEC.

About the middle of May last I left Quebec for Gaspé Basin, by the way of Port Dalhousie, N. B. and the steamer "Admiral." It was my intention to spend a week or more in this district collecting shells and insects.

Unfortunately I found the season very backward up there, the weather too was wet or cold during my stay; owing to this but little collecting could be done, and I was more than disgusted having journeyed so far for so little purpose.

The following specimens were taken or seen at Barachois, near Mal Baie ; this village is at the inner end of a deep bay, and is distant from Gaspé Basin some 25 miles, and from Percé about 10 miles.

With a few exceptions the land shells collected were found living in the grass on a sandy hillside close to the beach. The open coun-

[^1]
[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ Nautilus, Vol.vi, p. 112, Vol. vii, p. 39.

[^1]:    ${ }^{1}$ Mem. and Proc. Manchester Lit. and Philos. Suc., 1Ss- - S. Ser. 4. Vol. I, pp. 218 and 243 .

